## 2911 and 2915 Holly Street SUB \#2019-0003

City Council
September 14, 2019

## Subdivision Background

Request for a subdivision with a variation to re-subdivide four existing lots into three lots

Planning Commission voted to approve on a vote of 5-1

Resident opposition included comments on the size, height and design of the homes, driveway access, and stormwater runoff


## Appeal Review

City Council de novo public hearing to affirm, reverse or modify the decision of the Planning Commission or return the matter to the Commission for further consideration.

Analysis of the proposed re-subdivision to be based on subdivision standards and may not include the anticipated improvements on the proposed lots.

## Site Context

- Immediately surrounded by single-family dwellings
- Zoned R-8 / Single Family Zone
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## Re-subdivision request



## Request to re-subdivide four existing lots to three lots with a variation

## Subdivision Review

## Section 11-1700:

- Section 11-1710(D)

Proposed lots must meet zone requirements.

- Section 11-1710(B):
"shall be of substantially the same character as to suitability ... with respect to similarly situated lots within the adjoining portions of the original subdivision."
- Section 11-1713:

Criteria for review of the variations to the single-family lot requirements of the zone. Must meet Section 11-1713(A)(i), (ii), and one or more of (iii).


## Original Subdivision Plat



## Section 11-1710(B)



Area of comparison = original subdivision

Similarly situated lots = interior lots

Analysis found that lots were substantially the same character when compared to similarly situated lots within the original subdivision

| Lot Width (at building line) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Minimum (ft.): | 65 |
| 204 Macarthur Road | 136 |
| 2903 Holly Street | 80.5 |
| 2807 Holly Street | 80 |
| 2805 Holly Street | 80 |
| 2909 Holly Street | 74 |
| 209 Macarthur Road | 72 |
| 206 Birch Street | 71 |
| 2905 Russell Road | 70 |
| 209 Pine Street | 68.25 |
| 2901 Holly Street | 60 |
| 2809 Holly Street | 60 |
| 205 Birch Street | 60 |
| 204 Birch Street | 60 |
| 207 Pine Street | 60 |
| 205 Pine Street | 60 |
| 207 Birch Street | 58.75 |
| Lot 502 | 56 |
| 202 Birch Street | 55 |
| Lot 500 | 54.5 |
| Lot 501 | 54.5 |
| 205 Macarthur Road | 53 |
| 209 Birch Street | 51.75 |
| 207 Macarthur Road | 50 |
| 202 Macarthur Road | 48 |
| 203 Macarthur Road | 45 |
| 2811 A Holly Street | 40 |
|  |  |

## Comparison to Similarly Situated Lots

- Lot Area
- Lot 500-9,848 square feet Greater than
- Lot 501 - 9,251 square feet $\} 86 \%$ of similarly
- Lot 502 - 8,869 square feet $\}$ situated lots
- Lot Width
- Lot 500-54.5 feet
- Lot 501-54.5 feet
- Lot 502 - 56 feet

- Lot Frontage
- Lot 500-55 feet
- Lot 501-55 feet
- Lot 502 - 56.96 feet



## Section 11-1713 Variation Analysis

 Applicant's three points of justification
## 1. Section 11-1713(A)(i)

a strict adherence to the Zoning Ordinance provisions would result in substantial injustice.

> Section 11-1713 (B)
> "substantial injustice" means that the strict application of this ordinance would create an unreasonable burden on the development, use and enjoyment of the property which outweighs the land use or land development purposes served by the specific zoning provision or provisions of this ordinance at issue.

Summary of applicant's justification:
By not granting this variation, it would result in a substantial injustice and hardship as the proposed Lots reflect the use and general character of the neighborhood lots in terms of size and shape.

## Variation Analysis

2. Section 11-1713(A)(ii)
"the use and character of the resulting lots or parcels in such a subdivision would not be inconsistent with the use provisions of the zone in which the property is situated and with the existing development in the immediate area."

Summary of applicant's justification:
The area surrounding the proposed lots is developed with single-family detached homes with lots similar in size and character.

## Variation Analysis

## 3. Section 11-1713(A)(iii)(1)

"and one ... of the following special circumstances exists:
(1) Extremely rugged topography"

Summary of applicant's justification: The proposed lots have extremely rugged topography: the apex of the proposed lots is nearly 30 feet, which is a substantial grade change compared to Holly Street elevation.

Staff recommends that City Council affirm the decision of the Planning Commission from its meeting of June 25, 2019 to approve the re-subdivision with variation request.

## Additional Information
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## R-8 Zone Requirements

## 3-305-Lot requirements.

(A)

Lot size. Each principal use shall be located on a lot with a minimum land area of 8,000 square feet except in the case of a corner lot, in which case the minimum land area shall be 9,000 square feet.
(B)

Lot width. The minimum lot width at the building line shall be 65 feet except in the case of a corner lot, in which case the minimum lot width shall be 80 feet.
(C)

Lot frontage. The minimum lot frontage at the front lot line shall be 40 feet.

## 3-306-Bulk and open space regulations.

(A)

Yard requirements.
(1)

Front yard. Each use shall provide a front yard of at least 30 feet.
(2)

Side yards. Each residential use shall provide two side yards, each based on a setback ratio of $1: 2$ and a minimum size of eight feet. Each other use shall provide two side yards, each based on a setback ratio of $1: 1$ and a minimum size of 25 feet.
(3)

Rear yard. Each residential use shall provide a rear yard based on a setback ratio of $1: 1$ and a minimum size of eight feet. Each other use shall provide a rear yard based on a setback ratio of $1: 1$ and a minimum size of 25 feet.
(B)
$F A R$. The maximum permitted floor area ratio is 0.35 .
(C)

Height. The maximum permitted height of a structure is 35 feet except for a church or school use in which case the maximum permitted height is 40 feet.

